

in combination with a programmable receiver which has the programming means set out in applicant's claimed invention.

Regarding the passage at column 3, lines 16-18 of Pinnow, the clear import of this passage is that the transmitter device be capable of resetting or reprogramming the code, "so as to allow the coded signal to be changed whenever desired."

Finally, the passage at column 4, lines 31-42 of Pinnow describes a delay of a predetermined time period after the signal-receiving unit received a predetermined number of unauthorized code combinations before it could be addressed again by an optical transmitter. This does not suggest arming after receipt of an authorized code and subsequent disarming if another received code is correct, but only delays which are invoked after receipt of a number of unauthorized codes.

Applicant is submitting a further declaration as further evidence of the unobviousness of his invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing discussion of Pinnow, and in view of the evidence submitted by the accompanying declaration, that the obviousness rejection should now be withdrawn. That leaves only the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, which applicant can address by the filing of a terminal disclaimer. Such favorable action is now solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Larry K. Roberts  
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: February 29, 1996

Roberts and Quiogue  
P.O. Box 8569  
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569  
Telephone (714) 640-6200  
Facsimile (714) 640-1206